

O'Hare. That is why I ask my colleagues to join me in opposition to this bill today.

My hope is that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure will go back and move legislation again, and bring it back to the floor, which truly reflects the bipartisan agreement which expands O'Hare as well as moves forward on construction of an airport at Peotone.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation, as I noticed, breaks the agreement between the mayor and the Governor. I would note that the legislation, H.R. 3479, has no language in it which reflects the agreement that the Governor and mayor agreed to, which moves forward with the construction of a third airport at Peotone.

The legislation takes away the State of Illinois's rights and undercuts the authority of the State of Illinois to make its own decisions regarding air travel.

H.R. 3479 completely ignores the needs of the south suburbs of Chicago, where 2.5 million people live within 45 minutes of the proposed airport at Peotone. Additionally, I would note that failure to develop Peotone would shortchange the entire Chicago region by forfeiting almost 250,000 new jobs.

Unfortunately, H.R. 3479 does not pay any heed to the studies that have, since the 1980s, consistently shown that Chicago, the region, and our Nation will have aviation gridlock, and the best solution is a new airport, a third airport to serve the Chicago region. Both the Governor and mayor recognized these studies when they reached their agreement last year.

I would note that the bill that will be before us today breaks the agreement between the mayor and the Governor and does not reflect the integrity of the agreement. Nevertheless, the bill imposes a Federal solution on a State problem and does not have the full support of the Illinois delegation nor the people of Illinois, who will be most impacted by the legislation.

In fact, the three members of the Illinois delegation most affected by H.R. 3479, the gentlemen from Illinois, Mr. HYDE, Mr. JACKSON, and myself, stand in opposition to this bill this afternoon.

I support Chicago-O'Hare and believe it needs to be expanded and modernized to be a safer airport with more capacity, but expanding O'Hare is not enough. It will not solve the capacity problem or face it in the future. Even with the development of a south suburban airport, O'Hare can still expect a 40 percent increase in passenger load, so they are still going to increase their business.

Air travel is expected to double in the next 15 years. Expanding O'Hare will take 12 to 15 years, and we know we cannot land airplanes while pouring concrete. The south suburban airport at Peotone could be expanding capacity in just 4 to 5 years as a complement to O'Hare expansion. However, this legis-

lation will kill any development of a south suburban airport and keep Chicago aviation gridlocked for years to come.

Mr. Speaker, we need a bipartisan solution. The mayor and the Governor came together with an agreement. The bill before us today, H.R. 3479, fails to honor that agreement; in fact, it breaks the agreement between the mayor and the Governor.

I urge opposition to this bill and ask that my colleagues join me in voting "no."

#### CORPORATE GREED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 23, 2002, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it has been almost a week since President Bush went to Wall Street to present his plan to curb executive greed and corporate misgovernance. The response, unfortunately, has been pretty underwhelming. The markets dropped by several hundred points day after day after day. The press and the American people have openly questioned the President's commitment to real change.

Even Wall Street workers who attended the speech, mostly Bush supporters, wondered aloud about how much of the speech was just politics and how much was about real change.

Why was this speech so poorly received? One, because so many officials in the Bush administration are themselves former corporate CEOs, lawyers, and accountants who lack the moral authority or the will to change corporate practices, or even to enforce current law.

Second, because in the middle of the current crisis, the President and the Vice President, both former oil company CEOs, have been forced to answer questions about their own ethics and business practices in the private sector.

Third, because, despite his rhetorical calls for corporate America to clean up its act, President Bush continues to oppose real reform on Capitol Hill. He has refused to support meaningful pension and accounting reform; he opposes legislation to halt offshore tax avoidance by huge corporations; and, to make matters worse, even though America's capital markets lost \$2.4 trillion last year, more than the gross domestic product of Germany, the President continues to favor turning Social Security over to Wall Street in a privatization scheme. This is the same Wall Street that advised American investors to buy Enron and WorldCom and Adelphia and others while their analysts privately ridiculed those companies.

In addition, the President has supported a whole slew of bills that have been written by and for big industry. He supports energy legislation written by the oil companies, he supports envi-

ronmental legislation written by the chemical companies, he supports privatization of Social Security written by Wall Street bankers.

Most recently, the President endorsed a prescription drug benefit to be administered by the health insurance industry, the same people who brought us HMOs. This plan would provide seniors with totally inadequate coverage, making no provision for dealing with the outrageous prices Americans are paying for their prescription drugs. It would undercut seniors' purchasing power and enable the drug industry to sustain its outrageous drug prices.

Apparently, the President has been convinced by the brand-name big drug companies that prices are not a problem. Democrats are more concerned about the burden on seniors and their families who are being gouged by the predatory pricing of the prescription drug industry. The Democratic plan provides a direct prescription drug benefit inside Medicare and combats high prescription drug prices. The Republican plan, written by the drug companies, calls for a privatized system that coddles industry and leaves gaps in coverage for seniors.

The Republicans claim they are offering the best drug benefit possible under current budgetary constraints; but a year ago, when the Bush tax cut plan, the tax breaks, which went overwhelmingly to the richest 1 percent of people in this society, when that was being debated, we were assured by the President and Republican leadership of huge budget surpluses. We were told these surpluses would be enough to address long-term solvency of Medicare and Social Security and still have the money for education and the money for a prescription drug benefit. Since then, these projected surpluses promised by President Bush and others have evaporated, mostly because of the overly-generous-to-the-most-privileged-in-this-society tax cut.

Maybe the President and his administration, full of corporate executives, were using the same accounting practices as America's big companies. Maybe, Mr. Speaker, this is what President Bush and Vice President CHENEY meant when they said that, under their leadership, the country would be run like a corporation.

#### HONORING TED WILLIAMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 23, 2002, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, today we will honor Ted Williams, the baseball legend, here on the House floor. I am here this morning to also honor him.

On July 5, of course, of this year, he died. He is one of baseball's greatest legends. He was known as the "Splendid Splinter," "Teddy Ballgame," "the Kid," "the Thumper"; he was a man